



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/766,655	01/23/2001	Pradeep Bansal	3493.00020	4302

22907 7590 08/11/2005

BANNER & WITCOFF  
1001 G STREET N W  
SUITE 1100  
WASHINGTON, DC 20001

EXAMINER

RIMELL, SAMUEL G

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2165

DATE MAILED: 08/11/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/766,655

Applicant(s)

BANSAL, PRADEEP

Examiner

Sam Rimell

Art Unit

2165

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-98 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-98 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

  
SAM RIMELL  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_.

Art Unit: 2165

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-2, 4-6, 8-10, 12-14, 16-20, 22-32, 34-39, 41, 43-48, 50-52, 54-60, 62-66, 68-78, 80-85, 87 and 89-98 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Zamora-McKelvy et al. (U.S. Patent 6,519,616).

The reasons for this rejection were set forth in the office action of October 15, 2004 and are hereby incorporated by reference.

Claims 3, 11, 21, 33, 42, 49, 57, 67, 79 and 88 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zamora-McKelvy et al. (U.S. Patent 6,519,616) in view of Waites et al. (U.S. Patent 6,788,769).

The reasons for this rejection were set forth in the office action of October 15, 2004 and are hereby incorporated by reference.

Claims 7, 15, 40, 53, 61 and 86 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zamora-McKelvy et al. (U.S. Patent 6,519,616) in view of Waites (U.S. Patent 6,788,769) and further in view of McCallister et al. (U.S. Patent 6,421,672).

The reasons for this rejection were set forth in the office action of October 15, 2004 and are hereby incorporated by reference.

#### Remarks

Applicant's arguments and amendments have been considered.

Art Unit: 2165

Applicant's first argument is that the reference to Zamora-McKelvy et al. does not teach the presence of genealogical information. This argument has been fully considered, but examiner does not agree. The "genealogical" has not been defined in applicant's specification. While applicant does provide general examples of genealogical information, such as personal names, the specification does not give specific definition that would require that genealogical information only be personal names. The term "genealogical" is broader in scope and can refer to groups of individuals, such as companies. In the case of Zamora-McKelvy et al., the "genealogical information" (as required in the claims) is the information that can identify a set of companies having common characteristics. It is not required to be information identifying individual people having common characteristics. It is also not required to be a name, as claim 1 explicitly states that the genealogical information is not limited to being a name of an entity. FIG. 4 of Zamora-McKelvy et al. gives several examples of genealogical information that can identify sets of companies having common characteristics, such as the company name, listing ID number, or range of dates. This information, when input, will identify a set of companies having some common information to the search query, as seen in FIG. 5.

Claim 1 has been amended to state that the genealogical information can pertain to entities other than the user sought entity and which is not the name of the entity. In the case of Zamora-McKelvy et al. this would be the range of dates input in FIG. 4. As seen in FIG. 5, this range of dates can pertain to many different entities, not necessarily the single user sought entity, and at the same time, is not the name of any of the entities. As seen in FIG. 5, the date specification of "Sat, Mar 21" pertains to many different entities, and at the same time, is not the company name for any of the entities.

Claims 9, 26, 38, 47, 55, 72, 84, 93 and 96 have been amended to call for the genealogical information as information pertaining to an entity related to but separate from the user sought entity. In Zamora-McKelvy et al., this information would be the range of dates, as described in the previous paragraph.

Claims 17 and 63 have been amended to define first and second records differing in time. FIG. 5 of Zamora-McKelvy et al. teaches this feature by demonstrating five different records having differing time stamps.

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Sam Rimell at telephone number (571) 272-4084.



Sam Rimell  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2165